

## REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 9-11, 24, 28, and 32 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 24, 28, and 32 being independent.

Claim 32 has been added. Applicant submits that support for this claim can be found in the original disclosure and, therefore, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Claims 24 and 28 have been allowed.

Claims 1, 2, and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner asserts that it is unclear exactly what features in Applicant's disclosure constitute the claimed input means for inputting electronic information and input means for inputting list data. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

The structure that performs the function of inputting electronic information representing material data into a data processing apparatus is shown, for example, at least in Fig. 7 and discussed at least at page 16, lines 10-12. For example, Fig. 7 depicts, in block form, means 101 for inputting audio data 101, means 102 for inputting video data, and means 103 for inputting system data. Similarly, the structure that performs the function of inputting list data is shown, for example, at least in Fig. 7 and discussed at least at page 16, line 20 - page 17, line 1 and page 17, lines 9-17. For example, Fig. 7 depicts, in block form, means 107 for inputting audio patent list data, means 109 for inputting video patent list data, and means 111 for inputting system patent list data.

Applicant submits that the fact that these inputs are depicted in block form conveys to one skilled in the art that no particular structure is required, but rather any structure capable of performing the ubiquitous function of inputting information into a data

processing apparatus can be used. Indeed, structures for inputting audio data, video data, system data, and the like are well known to those skilled in the art. Likewise, structures for inputting list data are also well known to those skilled in the art. (One skilled in the art would understand that the list data is, for example, a list of patent numbers, countries, etc. - in other words, text data.) Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would readily be able to make and use the claimed invention using any well-known structure for inputting electronic information and list data (e.g., text information) into a data processing apparatus.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are requested. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that he explain what undue experimentation would be required for one skilled in the art to input electronic information and list data into a data processing apparatus.

Claims 1, 2, and 9-11 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. The Examiner asserts that the metes and bounds of the claim are unclear for the reasons given in the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph. As discussed above, Applicant submits that the specification discloses no critical reason for using any particular structure to input data but, rather, depicts the input means in block form because these are notoriously well-known structures and any structure that performs the inputting function can be used. In other words, Applicant submits that the claim encompasses any known structure for inputting the claimed data, since no particular input structure is critical. The scope of the claim is not indefinite merely because some limitations are broad, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

New Claim 32 has been drafted based on Claim 1, except that the claimed input means are recited as first and second input terminals in Claim 32. Claim 32 is believed

patentable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. L. Klock', is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant  
Brian L. Klock  
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
BLK/mls

DC\_MAIN 265846v1